



01-16-03

AF 3600

Express Mail Label No. EV 166985175 US

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/255,968	
	Filing Date	February 23, 1999	
	First Named Inventor	ANDERSON, Nancy L., et al.	
	Group Art Unit	3621	
	Examiner Name	James A. Reagan	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	19	Attorney Docket Number	P03735US0

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks Applicant's Reply Brief For Appeal (6 pages in triplicate)		RECEIVED JAN 21 2003 GROUP 3600

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	KIRK M. HARTUNG
Signature	<i>Kirk M. Hartung</i>
Date	

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: January 15, 2003			
Typed or printed name	KIRK M. HARTUNG		
Signature	<i>Kirk M. Hartung</i>	Date	January 15, 2003

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



#10/Reply
Brief
1-22-03
Lowman

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

IN RE APPLICATION OF: METHOD AND MEANS FOR
EVALUATING CUSTOMER
SERVICE PERFORMANCE

Appeal No.

SERIAL NO: 09/255,968

**APPLICANT'S REPLY
BRIEF
FOR APPEAL**

FILED: FEBRUARY 23, 1999

FOR: VISION INSIGHT LLC

Group Art Unit: 3621

Examiner: JAMES A. REAGAN

Attorney Docket No: P03735US0

RECEIVED

JAN 21 2003

GROUP 3600


Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231

Dear Sirs:

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 18, 2002, Applicant submits the following remarks.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL

I hereby certify that this **APPLICANT'S REPLY BRIEF FOR APPEAL FOR PATENT APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 09/255,968** for **NANCY L. ANDERSON** and **LOIS J. PANNKUK** and documents referred to as enclosed therein are being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Box Appeal, Washington, D.C. 20231, prior to 5:00 p.m. on 15 day of January, 2003.


Kirk M. Hartung
Express Mail Label EV 166985175 US

REMARKS

A. THE CLAIMS DISTINGUISH OVER THE CITED REFERENCES

Independent claim 1 is directed towards a method of evaluating customer service performance "of a specific employee at a point of transaction and at a time of transaction." Similarly, independent claim 23 is directed towards a method of evaluating customer service performance "of an employee at a point of transaction and at a time of transaction." Independent claim 31 is directed towards a system for collecting customer feedback " of an employee's performance at a point of transaction and at a time of transaction." Each of these independent claims requires that at the point of transaction and the time of transaction the customer be presented with a question about the employee's performance and respond to the question. These limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

The Matyas patent, which is the primary reference relied upon by the Examiner in the rejection of the claims, discloses a method and means for conducting an Internet purchase of goods. The Examiner acknowledges that Matyas does not teach feedback about the employee's performance, as required by the claims. (Examiner's Answer, page 2). The Examiner relies upon the Cadotte patent as teaching the collection of survey information about employees. (Examiner's Answer, pages 2-3). The Examiner suggests that the motivation to combine Matyas and Cadotte is the increase customer feedback and the allowance for a more timely and accurate measure of customer satisfaction with regard to the efficiency of an employee. (Examiner's Answers, page 3). However, there is no clear and particular showing for this conclusion.

Both Matyas and Cadotte teaches customer feedback through surveys. There is no basis to conclude that the Cadotte surveys would increase customer feedback beyond the Matyas

surveys. To the extent the Examiner suggests that the increase in feedback relates to the efficiency of an employee, there would be no increase in such feedback in Matyas since no employee is present or utilized in the Matyas Internet transaction. There is no reason to ask employee performance questions in the Matyas transaction since there is no employee in Matyas to evaluate. Therefore, the Examiner's suggested combination of Matyas and Cadotte is improper.

More particularly, as the Federal Circuit in *In re Fitch* stated:

"Obviousness can not be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under § 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. Although couched in terms of combining teachings found in the prior art, the same inquiry must be carried out in the context of a proported obvious "modification" of the prior art. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." (Emphasis added) *In re Fitch* 23 U.S.P.Q. 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

It was further stated by the Federal Circuit in *Ex Parte Levengood* that:

" . . . an Examiner cannot establish obviousness by locating references which describe various aspects of a patent applicant's invention without also providing evidence that the motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the patent applicant has done". *Ex Parte Levengood*, 28 U.S.P.Q. 1300, 1302 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has stated, "citing references which merely indicate that isolated elements and/or features recited in claims are known is not sufficient bases for concluding that the combination of claimed elements would have been obvious." *Ex parte Hyamizu*, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1393, 1394 (BPAI 1988).

In short, as stated by the Federal Circuit,

"It is wrong to use the patent-in-suit as a guide through the maze of prior art references, combining the right references in the right way so as to achieve the result of the claims-in-suit."

Orthopedic Equipment Co. v. United States, 702 F.2d 1005, 1012, 217 U.S.P.Q. 193, 199 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The Federal Circuit has also explained that there must be "some objective teaching" leading to the combination. *In re Fitch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265 (Fed. Cir. 1992). As further explained in *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999) this showing must be "clear and particular."

Here, the Examiner has provided no clear and particular objective teaching leading to the combination of Matyas and Cadotte. Therefore, the § 103 obviousness rejection should be reversed.

B. THE EXAMINER HAS MISCONSTRUED THE MATYAS PATENT

On page 2 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserts that Matyas teaches presenting a question to a customer "at the point of transaction" and obtaining a response to the question from the customer "at the point of transaction." Matyas undisputably relates to Internet transactions. However, in such Internet transactions, it is debatable whether there is any "point of transaction", and if there is such a point, is it at the buyer's end, the seller's end, or some place in cyberspace? (There is substantial discussion among state governments concerning the "point of transaction" issue with regard to Internet sales, since the states each want the sales tax revenue generated by such transactions.) Matyas does not teach any "point of transaction" and the Examiner fails to identify any "point of transaction" in Matyas.

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner concludes that "a purchase made over the Internet from a home computer is equivalent to a point of transaction and a point of sale made from any retail establishment." However, the Examiner ignores one of the primary differences between an Internet sale and a retail sale, that is, the face to face interaction which is absent in an Internet transaction. One of the primary objectives of the present invention is the evaluation of employee performance. However, as discussed above, in the Internet transaction of Matyas, there is no employee to evaluate.


The Examiner further states on page 11 of his Answer that the survey conducted by the Matyas invention is completed "at a time of the transaction." To the contrary, there is no such teaching or suggestion in Matyas. Matyas clearly states that the product survey information is collected from buyers that have "previously purchased products from the seller" (col. 3, lines 6-9), and that the buyer "later provides survey information to the evaluator" (col. 3, lines 29-30). There is no disclosure in Matyas that the surveys be conducted at the time of transaction or purchase. Therefore, the Examiner's conclusions on page 11 of his Answer are unsupported by the Matyas patent.

The Examiner quotes on page 10 from the Matyas background and discussions of SET protocols and POS transactions. This is merely background information and does not broaden the scope or disclosure of the Matyas patent beyond its Internet transaction. On page 14, the Examiner states that "the transactions and the survey conducted by the Matyas invention are completed 'at a point of transaction and at a time of transaction.'" However, neither the Examiner nor Matyas identify the "point" of the transaction, and Matyas clearly teaches that the surveys are conducted later for previous purchasers of the goods.

C. CONCLUSION

There is no clear and particular objective teaching leading to the combination of Matyas and Cadotte. Also, the Examiner's interpretation of Matyas is not supported by the Matyas Specification or drawings. Therefore, the § 103 obviousness rejection based upon Matyas and Cadotte should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kirk M. Hartung", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kirk M. Hartung, Reg. No. 34,021
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE
Attorneys of Record

801 Grand Avenue - Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
515-288-3667 phone
515-288-1338 fax - bja